

SK



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,742	06/14/2000	Venkata S. Ayyagari	06502.0301	9037
22852	7590	01/07/2004	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			NGUYEN, THANH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2144	

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/593,742

Applicant(s)

AYYAGARI ET AL.

Examiner

Tammy T Nguyen

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. This action is in response to the reconsideration filed. **October 16, 2003**
2. Claims **1-19** are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filled on October 16, 2003 have been fully considered, however they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:
4. Applicants argue that Crosskey and Huang do not disclose or suggest determining whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache, when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache, providing the processed version of the document to the client. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintain the rejection because Crosskey alone discloses determining whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache, when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache, providing the processed version of the document to the client as shown in col.5, lines 15-34. Clearly show that a processed version of the document is located in local cache then providing the processed version of the document to the client.

5. Therefore, the Examiner asserts that cited prior arts teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 19. Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-14, and 16-18 are also rejected at least by the virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action [see paper no. 6].
6. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are respectfully rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9-11, 13, 14-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosskey et al., (hereinafter Crosskey) U.S. Patent No. 6,035,281 in view of Huang et al., (hereinafter Huang) U.S. Patent No. 6,292,835.

9. As to claim 1, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, including method for processing content requests in a network having at least one content provider having stored documents in an unprocessed format, a proxy server and at least one client, the method comprising the following steps performed by the proxy server, of: receiving a request from the client for a document associated with the content provider (Fig.1, content provider 4 and client computer 1, and col.5, lines 1-10) determining whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache (col.5, lines 10-25); when it is determined that the processed version of

the document is located in the local cache, providing the processed version of the document to the client (col.5, lines 10-34); and when it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, Crosskey does not teach the (i) obtaining the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client. However, Huang teaches the obtaining the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client (col.4, lines 2-45, and col.5, lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey and Huang to have processed version of the identified processed document to the client includes in a communication system because it would be useful to have a series of actions, changes, or functions bringing about a result.

10. As to claim 2, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of processing the unprocessed document, further comprises the step of storing the processed version of the document in the local cache (col.5, lines 10-25).

11. As to claim 4, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document, further comprises the step of converting the unprocessed document from a first markup language to a second markup language (col.5, lines 34-47).

12. As to claim 6, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, including method

for processing content requests in a network having at least one content provider having stored documents in an unprocessed format, a proxy server (Fig. 1, OLSP Proxy server) and at least one client (client computer 1), the method comprising the following steps performed by the proxy server, of: receiving an unprocessed document from the content provider (Fig. 1, content provider 4, 10), wherein the document was requested by the client (Fig. 1, client computer 1, and col. 5, lines 1-10); determining whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache (col. 6, lines 50-64); when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache (col. 6, lines 1-34), providing the processed version of the document to the client (col. 5, lines 25-35); and when it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, Crosskey does not teach (i) processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (ii) providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client. However, Huang teaches the processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (ii) providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client (col. 4, lines 2-45, and col. 5, lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey and Huang to have processed version of the identified processed document to the client includes in a communication system because it would useful to have a series of actions, changes, or functions bringing about a result.

13. As to claim 7, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of processing the unprocessed document, further comprises the step of storing the processed version of the document in the local cache (Fig. 1, client computer 1, and col. 5, lines 10-25).

14. As to claim 9, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the step of processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document, further comprises the step of converting the unprocessed document from a first markup language to a second markup language (col.5, lines 34-47).

15. As to claim 10, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, including an Internet Proxy server comprising: a memory having program instructions (Fig.1, OLSP Proxy server); and a processor configured to use the program instructions to receive a request from the client for a document associated with the content provider (Fig.1, content provider.4, 10 and client computer 1, and col.5, lines 1-10); to determine whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache (col.6, lines 1-34); when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache, to provide the processed version of the document to the client (col.5, lines 1-25). Crosskey does not teach it is determined that the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (i) obtain the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) process the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) provide the processed version of the identified processed document to the client. However, Huang teaches the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (i) obtain the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) process the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) provide the processed version of the identified processed document to the client (col.4, lines 2-45, and col.5, lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey

and Huang to have processed version of the identified processed document to the client includes in a communication system because it would useful to have a series of actions, changes, or functions bringing about a result.

16. As to claim 11, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the instruction to process the unprocessed document, further comprises the step of storing the processed version of the document in the local cache (col.5, lines 10-25).

17. As to claim 13, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the instruction to process the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document, further comprises the instruction to convert the unprocessed document from a first markup language to a second markup language (col.5, lines 34-47).

18. As to claim 15, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, including an Internet Proxy server comprising: a memory having program instructions (Fig.1, OLSP Proxy server); and a processor configured to use the program instructions to receive an unprocessed document from the content provider wherein the document was requested by the client (Fig.1, content provider.4, 10 and client computer 1, and col.5, lines 1-10); to determine whether a processed version of the document is located in a local cache (col.6, lines 1-34); when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache, to provide the processed version of the document to the client (col.5, lines 1-25). Crosskey does not teach the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (i) process the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (ii) provide the processed version of the identified processed

document to the client. However, Huang teaches the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (i) process the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (ii) provide the processed version of the identified processed document to the client (col.4, lines 2-45, and col.5, lines 10-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey and Huang to have processed version of the identified processed document to the client includes in a communication system because it would useful to have a series of actions, changes, or functions bringing about a result.

19. As to claim 16, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the instruction to process the unprocessed document, further comprises the instruction of storing the processed version of the document in the local cache (col.5, lines 10-25).

20. As to claim 18, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the instruction to process the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document, further comprises the instruction to convert the unprocessed document from a first markup language to a second markup language (col.5, lines 34-47).

21. As to claim 19, Crosskey teaches the invention as claimed, including a data processing system for processing content requests in a network having at least one content provider having stored documents in an unprocessed format, a proxy server and at least one client, the system comprising: means for receiving a request from the client for a document associated with the content provider (Fig.1, content provider.4, 10 and client computer 1, and col.5, lines 1-10); means for determining whether a processed version of the document is located

in a local cache (col.6, lines 1-34); when it is determined that the processed version of the document is located in the local cache, means for providing the processed version of the document to the client (col.5, lines 1-25); Crosskey does not teach the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (i) means for obtaining the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) means for processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) means for providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client. However, Huang teaches the processed version of the document is not located in the local cache, (i) means for obtaining the unprocessed document associated with the content provider; (ii) means for processing the unprocessed document in accordance with predetermined instructions associated with the unprocessed document; and (iii) means for providing the processed version of the identified processed document to the client. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey and Huang to have processed version of the identified processed document to the client includes in a communication system because it would be useful to have a series of actions, changes, or functions bringing about a result.

22. Claims 3, 5, 8, 12, 14, and 17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosskey et al., (hereinafter Crosskey) U.S. Patent No. 6,035,281 and Huang et al., (hereinafter Huang) U.S. Patent No. 6,292,835 in view of Caldwell et al., (hereinafter Caldwell) U.S. Patent No. 6,421,673.

23. As to claim 3, Crosskey and Huang do not teach the invention as claimed,

wherein the step of determining whether a processed version of the document is located in local cache, further comprises the step of ascertaining whether the document is written in a second markup language, wherein said second markup language is a processed version of said first markup language. However, Caldwell teaches ascertaining whether the document is written in a second markup language, wherein said second markup language is a processed version of said first markup language (col.3, lines 30-40, and col.7, lines 10-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Caldwell to have the document is written in a second markup language includes in a communication system because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions can be used to describe a number of different kinds of data as well as text. Allowing programs to modify and validate documents in these languages without prior knowledge, that is written and stored on a computer.

24. As to claim 5, Crosskey and Huang do not teach the invention as claimed, wherein said second markup language is the extensible markup language (XML). However, Caldwell teaches markup language is the extensible markup language (XML) (col.7, lines 10-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Caldwell to have the document is written in a second markup language includes in a communication system because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions can be used to describe a number of different kinds of data as well as text. Allowing programs to modify and validate documents in these languages without prior knowledge, that is written and stored on a computer.

25. As to claim 8, Crosskey and Huang do not teach the invention as claimed,

wherein the step of determining whether a processed version of the document is located in local cache, further comprises the step of ascertaining whether the document is written in a second markup language, wherein said second markup language is a processed version of said first markup language. However, Caldwell teaches ascertaining whether the document is written in a second markup language, wherein said second markup language is a processed version of said first markup language (col.3, lines 30-40, and col.7, lines 10-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Caldwell to have the document is written in a second markup language includes in a communication system because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions can be used to describe a number of different kinds of data as well as text. Allowing programs to modify and validate documents in these languages without prior knowledge, that is written and stored on a computer.

26. As to claim 12, Crosskey and Huang do not teach the invention as claimed, wherein the instruction to determine whether a processed version of the document is located in local cache, further comprises the instruction to ascertain whether the document is written in a second markup language, wherein said second markup language is a processed version of said first markup language. However, Caldwell teaches ascertaining whether the document is written in a second markup language, wherein said second markup language is a processed version of said first markup language (col.3, lines 30-40, and col.7, lines 10-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Caldwell to have the document is written in a second markup language includes in a communication system because it would have an efficient system

that can provide specific functions can be used to describe a number of different kinds of data as well as text. Allowing programs to modify and validate documents in these languages without prior knowledge, that is written and stored on a computer.

27. As to claim 14, Crosskey and Huang do not teach the invention as claimed, wherein said second markup language is the extensible markup language (XML). However, Caldwell teaches markup language is the extensible markup language (XML) (col.7, lines 10-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Caldwell to have the document is written in a second markup language includes in a communication system because it would have an efficient system that can provide specific functions can be used to describe a number of different kinds of data as well as text. Allowing programs to modify and validate documents in these languages without prior knowledge, that is written and stored on a computer.

28. As to claim 17, Crosskey and Huang do not teach the invention as claimed, wherein the instruction to determine whether a processed version of the document is located in local cache, further comprises the step to ascertain whether the document is written in a second markup language, wherein said second markup language is a processed version of said first markup language. However, Caldwell teaches ascertaining whether the document is written in a second markup language, wherein said second markup language is a processed version of said first markup language (col.3, lines 30-40, and col.7, lines 10-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Crosskey, Huang and Caldwell to have the document is written in a second markup language includes in a communication system because it would have an efficient system that can

provide specific functions can be used to describe a number of different kinds of data as well as text. Allowing programs to modify and validate documents in these languages without prior knowledge, that is written and stored on a computer.

Conclusion

29. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


30. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 305-7982**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. eastern standard time.

Application/Control Number: 09/593,742
Art Unit: 2143

Page 14

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding this instant application, please send it to (703) 872-9306. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, **David Wiley**, may be reached at (703) 308-5221.

TTN
October 2nd, 2003



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100